

Today's Topics:

AMSAT BBS
ARRL (2 msgs)
Dual band HTs
Meteor Scatter Beacon
Re^2: Weather Facsimile Reception
rec.scanners

Date: 6 Dec 89 02:40:16 GMT
From: uw-entropy!dataio!pilchuck!ssc!tad@beaver.cs.washington.edu (Tad Cook)
Subject: AMSAT BBS
Message-ID: <304@ssc.UUCP>

I posted a request for the AMSAT BBS number. Some nice gentleman sent me a message saying it was 303-447-3003. I called that number, and it is disconnected. Anybody else have their number?

73,
Tad Cook
tad@ssc.UUCP
KT7H @ N7HFZ

Date: 6 Dec 89 16:08:47 GMT
From: stout!elmore@handies.ucar.edu (Kim Elmore)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <5570@ncar.ucar.edu>

In article <7327@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:
>In article <24896@ubvax.UB.Com>, hardwick@ubvax.UB.Com (Bob Hardwick) writes:
>>

...stuff deleted concerning some ASM's opinion that no sane
ham could possible have valid reason to modify their equipment
and how they're gonna try to send you to Leavenworth if you
even think about it.

>>
>> Mike N6KZB @ N6KZB Orange Section ARRL ASM.
>> Telecommunications Engineer II, RCOFD.
>>
>>
>> If this is what the ARRL is doing with our dues money then
>> the ARRL has just lost a member.

Don't think this is League policy; the ASM decided that he knew
what was legal and positioned himself as a vigilante.

>

>The ARRL has a lot of volunteer helpers who can do as they please without
>reference to ARRL. So this is probably not ARRL policy, just the views of
>an ASM. That being said, I agree with the views expressed. I don't care if
>you like it or not, modification for out of band service (MARS and CAP
>excepted) seems to be illegal. What gives hams the right to do this? What if
>everyone started carrying around non-type approved radios on police/fire/etc
>frequencies. What if CBers start modifying their radios to operate on 10m.
>Where do you draw the line.

>

stuff deleted about what should be posted to rec.ham-radio.

>

>

Bob Atkins, KA1GT

>

I beg to differ, Bob. First, I don't think it's illegal to own a radio that can transmit outside of whatever frequencies I'm licensed for. If it is, I'm in big trouble with my TS-930S because that rice-box will transmit above the ham phone bands just fine as it came from the factory. I have modified my TH-75 for out of band transmit, not for the purpose of transmitting out of band, but so I could expand the receive coverage. It so happens that in doing so, the transmit capability was also opened up. In the case of 70 cm, I can now transmit anywhere in the 70 cm band, not just in the repeater portion meaning I can now monitor packet activity! If it were truly illegal to *own* equipment that could transmit outside of one's licensed capability, most hams would be in deep yogurt.

We can modify our radios in any way we wish, we just can't transmit outside of our allocation. There are lots of valid reasons to do this. CB'ers can *own* ham equipment if they wish, but they can't legally transmit with it... Unfortunately, the FCC doesn't seem terribly interested in enforcing those rules right now, but that's another discussion :-)

To those diligent souls who uncover all these mods, thanks very much! Keep up the good work! Along those lines, anybody know how to turn a Kenwood TH-75 into a cross-band repeater?

Merry Christmas!

Kim Elmore, N50P

Disclaimer: Nobody around here could care less...

Date: 6 Dec 89 16:32:00 GMT

From: silver!commgrp@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <12600088@silver>

>> Local ARRL jock opposes dissemination of "illegal" radio mod

>> information.

> KA9Q enumerates legitimate reasons for modifying radios.

I recently posted a mod for Icom IC-2GAT, and mentioned that a friend had verified it.

The young ham who modified his 2GAT got his license only 3 months ago, and it is his first rig. He was very apprehensive about opening the radio and soldering an extra diode among the tiny surface-mount components inside. His delight upon success was wonderful to see!

Graduation from appliance-operator to hacker is a significant rite of passage for any ham, no matter how simple the actual operation. Thus reinforced, he will advance to more complex hardware projects. The complexity of modern commercially-made ham gear can intimidate people from one of ham radio's major purposes and delights, experimentation. I'm glad that many modern rigs have simple ways to make profound modifications.

--

Frank W9MKV reid@gold.bacs.indiana.edu

Date: 6 Dec 89 15:16:33 GMT
From: usc!wuarchive!texbell!texsun!newstop!east!hienergy!jimv@ucsd.edu (Jim Vienneau - CSD Program Manager)
Subject: Dual band HTs
Message-ID: <1186@east.East.Sun.COM>

Tried to mail, but bounced:

I have the ICOM IC-32AT, I like it alot, typical bullet-proof ICOM construction. Easy to mode for extended rcv in both vhf and uhf, also cross band rpttr mod is easy. It's also the only one to put out 5 watts with the included (BP-70) battery. Only two negatives, it's on the heavy side (that BP-70 is fairly heavy) and you cannot listen to both vhf and uhf at the same time (no balance control). It will listen to one and monitor the other and switch based on the priority you set though. I hear the Yeasu FT470 has problems, I'd stay away. A friend bought the Kenwood TH-75 at the same time I got the ICOM and he seems happy with it, it's a little lighter, but only puts out 2.5 watts on high power. Either the ICOM or the Kenwood are good choices in my opinion. I'm sure there are some Yeasu owner's that will swear it's a good rig also :-), Caveat Emptor!

Jim Vienneau - KC10U
Sun Microsystems - Billerica, MA
sun!suneast!jimv
(508)671-0372

Date: 6 Dec 89 16:14:01 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!oakhill!charlie@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Charlie Thompson)
Subject: Meteor Scatter Beacon
Message-ID: <2702@radio.oakhill.UUCP>

Since there is a commercial meteor scatter system in place (monitoring snowfall?) it would be nice to tune in to the master station's beacon frequency and "listen" for meteors. What frequencies in the US are currently in use as the master station for meteor communication? Bob Parnass... is there any way you can look this up in your database? The name of the company was Meteor Communications Corp of Kent, Wash. I think.

Thanks in advance,
Charlie Thompson

Date: 6 Dec 89 14:36:23 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!gem.mps.ohio-state.edu!ctrsol!IDA.ORG!
roskos@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Eric Roskos)
Subject: Re^2: Weather Facsimile Reception
Message-ID: <1989Dec6.143623.8604@IDA.ORG>

rusty@garnet.berkeley.edu writes:

>Here's more stuff:
>From: 656-3799 BJ Backitis Information Systems Development
>
>The person to contact is:
>
>Ms. Mona F. Smith

With regard to the above, *please* don't write to NOAA requesting information unless you are actually building a satellite ground station! NOAA NESDIS is not that well-funded, as you can tell if you've ever seen the diagrams/descriptions of their equipment, and it costs them a good bit to send out the literature. It's currently hard to get them to reply to requests for information (I have been waiting several months already to receive information on the TIROS DSB Beacon content), apparently because they just don't have that many people available to do that sort of thing.

The information provided in their literature is primarily information about how to calculate the orbits of the satellites, etc. A lot of it is out of date, since it tells how to manually calculate the orbits using maps and charts, whereas there is public-domain software available (such as ORBIT23 on SIMTEL20) which does all that for you automatically.

Much more useful information for getting started is found in the ARRL "Satellite Experimenter's Handbook," which tells how to build the required antennas, gives information on properties of the signal, etc., and in Larry Horn's "Communications Satellites" book from Grove Enterprises, which contains the same information as in the NOAA literature (and in more detail, for the most part). The Grove book also tells about the Soviet satellites, which aren't mentioned in the NOAA literature. The commercially-available (low-cost) packages people have mentioned, such as Elmer Schwittek's package, also contain this information. NOAA is currently very helpful with people building ground stations, but this is largely due to the efforts of Earl Popham, who was personally interested in helping radio amateurs, and who recently retired after many years with NOAA.

--

Eric Roskos (roskos@CS.IDA.ORG or Roskos@DOCKMASTER.NCSC.MIL)

Date: Wed, 06 Dec 89 07:47:41 EDT
From: Mike Owen W9IP <MROWEN%STLAWU.BITNET@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>
Subject: rec.scanners

Bob, KA1GT, suggests that the voluminous scanner information currently occupying the net should be distributed elsewhere. I most firmly agree. This is rec.Ham radio, after all. Scanner fans have every right to air their views, discuss whatever they want to, distribute frequencies, etc. But if this net is for ham radio, that's what its postings should contain. I just don't have any interest in that topic, and I doubt that most of the amateur radio operator readers of the net have much interest in it, either.

This point was at the root of my "who cares?" mini-flame last week. It was amusing to see that all the responses in support came via direct e-mail whereas all but one of the hate-flames were posted globally. No doubt Bob's (and this) posting will generate the same fiery response from our scanner friends.

Go ahead, make my day.

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #980
